

**REMARKS**

This amendment is in response to the Official Action dated July 8, 2004, the shortened statutory period for filing a response expiring on October 8, 2004. Applicant submits herewith a one-month extension petition to reset the deadline for responding to the Official Action to and including November 8, 2004. In view of the following remarks, reconsiderations of the Examiner's rejections and Notice of Allowance are all pending claims is respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicant extends his gratitude for the Examiner's indication that this application contains patentable subject matter. In this regard, the Examiner has indicated that claims 13-15 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim, and any intervening claims. In light of the comments presented herein, Applicant has not rewritten these claims in independent form in the present amendment.

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Applicant has not added additional claims, nor has Applicant cancelled claims in this Amendment. Accordingly, claims 1-15 remain pending.

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,517,093 issued to Feng ("*Feng*"). Claims 2-6, 11 and 12 ultimately depend from claim 1. As such, if claim 1 is shown to overcome the § 102 rejection over *Feng*, claims 2-6, 11, and 12 will necessarily overcome the rejection.

Among other features also found in claim 1, the Examiner contends that *Feng* discloses a bracket assembly 10 and a latching means 40 for locking the bracket in a folded or working position relative to the front column. Notwithstanding the Examiner's position, it does not appear that *Feng* fully

anticipates each of the elements of claim 1. For example, claim 1 states:

A bracket rotatably attached to said front column with a pivot shaft, to allow said bracket to be rotatable relative to said pivot shaft, and rotatable towards said front column to a working position, and rotatable away from said front column to a folding position, said bracket including a longitudinal axis.

Thus, it is clearly a feature of claim 1 that the bracket be rotatable toward the front column to a working position and rotatable away from the front column to a folding position. The relationship of this bracket is shown most clearly in Figs. 7 and 8, where Figs. 7 represents the bracket in the working position and Fig. 8 represents the bracket in the folding position. As clearly shown in these figures, the bracket 7 is farthest away from the front column 20 in Fig. 8, the folding position.

Conversely, defining the bracket assembly as element 10, as the Examiner has in reference to the *Feng* patent, it is clear that the bracket assembly rotates toward the front column in a folding position and away from the front column in a working position, which is opposite to their relationship as claimed in claim 1. This relationship is shown most clearly in Figs. 1 and 6 of the *Feng* disclosure. In Fig. 1, the trailing arms 15 are in the working position, such that the bracket is rotated away from the front column. In Fig. 6, the trailing arms are in the folding position such that the bracket is rotated toward the front column. Again, this is the opposite relationship to that claimed in claim 1. As such, *Feng* may not be properly utilized as a § 102(e) anticipating reference. In addition, claim 1 features:

"Means for detachably latching said bracket and thus said left and said right trailing

arm to said front column at said working position."

Whereas, the bracket claimed in claim 1 is detachable from the front column at the working position, nowhere in *Feng* is there taught a detachable bracket. Fig. 2 of *Feng* shows a bracket assembly 10 in an exploded view. The front tube 18 includes portions that bound the front column 13. Even when folded, which in itself is unlike the claimed folding of claim 1, the front tube 18 of the bracket assembly 10 remains latched with the front column. This represents yet another reason why *Feng* may not properly be used as a § 102(e) anticipating reference.

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Feng* in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,485,039 issued to Ming-Fu ("*Ming-Fu*"). In light of the Applicant's comments set forth above with respect to *Feng*, it is firmly believed that the § 103(a) rejection has been overcome, and no additional comments are warranted.

Notwithstanding Applicant's firm belief that the rejected dependant claims, claims 2-6, 7-10, 11, and 12 are patentable by virtue of arguments made with respect to claim 1, Applicant further believes that such claims include patentable features in their own right.

Finally, Applicant notes that the Examiner indicated in conversation that the Office Action Summary erroneously indicated that the drawings were objected to. As such, there is no need for Applicant to submit revised drawings.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: November 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By Scott E. Charney  
Scott E. Charney  
Registration No.: 51,548  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant